

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

**Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

,

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

Finding of No Significant Impact	vii
Ultra's proposed access road and pipeline reroute for the Three Rivers Fed 33-23-720 well pad	vii
Signature	vii
Decision Record	ix
Decision	ix
Summary of the Selected Alternative	ix
Rationale for the Decision	ix
Appeals	ix
Authorizing Official	x
Conditions of Approval (COAs)	x
1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)	1

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Tables

Table 1. Well Data	ix
Table 2. New Surface Disturbance	ix
Table 1.1. List of Preparers	3

This page intentionally
left blank

Finding of No Significant Impact

Ultra's proposed access road and pipeline reroute for the Three Rivers Fed 33-23-720 well pad

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA), and considering the significance criteria in 40 CFR 1508.27, I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

Signature

Approved by:

/s/ Jerry Kenczka	1/29/2015
Authorized Officer	Date
AFM for Minerals	

This page intentionally
left blank

Decision Record

Decision

It is my decision to authorize Ultra's proposed access road, pipeline and power line corridor reroute as described in the proposed action of DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0068-DNA.

Table 1. Well Data

Well Identification	Pad	Legal Location	Lease
Three Rivers Fed 33-16T-720	Three Rivers Fed 33-23-720	NESW Sec 33 T7S R20E	UTU-85592
Three Rivers Fed 33-23-720			
Three Rivers Fed 33-26T-720			
Three Rivers Fed 33-133-720			

Summary of the Selected Alternative

This decision includes the following components:

Table 2. New Surface Disturbance

Access Road on BLM		Access Road on Fee (Private)		Pipeline and Power Line on BLM		Pipeline and Power Line on Fee (Private)		Total
Feet	Acres*	Feet	Acres*	Feet	Acres*	Feet	Acres*	Acres*
139	0.1	1659	1.1	115	0.1	1101	0.8	2.1
* Approximate Acres								

Rationale for the Decision

The proposed access road and pipeline reroute meets the BLM's purpose and need to allow the lessee to develop the subject mineral leases indicated above. The need for the action is established by BLM Onshore Orders (43 CFR 3160) which requires the BLM to review and approve sundries on all operations conducted on a Federal or Indian oil and gas lease.

An on-site review of the access road, pipeline and power line corridor was held on 1/23/2014; the surface owner was invited to attend but did not. No issues or concerns were identified by the surface owner. The BLM received certification from the operator on 1/07/2014 of a surface owner's agreement, or adequate information showing a surface owner's agreement is in place.

Appeals

This decision is effective upon the date it is signed by the authorized officer. The decision is subject to appeal. Under BLM regulation, this decision is subject to administrative review in accordance with 43 CFR 3165. Any request for administrative review of this decision must include information required under 43 CFR 3165.3(b) (State Director Review), including all supporting documentation. Such a request must be filed in writing with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, P.O. Box 45155, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84145-0155, within 20 business days of the date this Decision is received or considered to have been received.

If you wish to file a petition for stay, the petition for stay should accompany your notice of appeal and shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied;
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits;
3. The likelihood of irreparable harm to the appellant or resources if the stay is not granted;
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Authorizing Official

/s/ Jerry Kenczka	1/29/2015
Authorized Officer	Date
AFM for Minerals	

Conditions of Approval (COAs)

- All COAs established in the original pad NEPA EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2014-0226-EA will be followed

Chapter 1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

This page intentionally
left blank

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Vernal, UT

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0068-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: UTU-85592

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Ultra's proposed access road, pipeline, and power line corridor reroute for the Three Rivers Fed 33-23-720 well pad.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: NESw Sec 33 T7S R20E Mer SLB

APPLICANT (if any): Ultra Resources Inc

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Ultra Resources, Inc. respectfully request approval to relocate the previously authorized access, pipeline, and power line corridor to the Three Rivers Fed 33-23-720 pad containing the Three Rivers Fed 33-16T-720, 33-23-720, 33-26T-720, and 33-133-720 wells. The corridor is being relocated from Winder surface where surface use is unobtainable to offset UPL Three Rivers Holdings, LLC (Ultra Resources, Inc.) surface. The corridor relocation requires a minor relocation of the associated federal corridor segment resulting in an overall shorter corridor that makes better use of existing disturbance in the area.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name: Vernal RMP Date Approved: October 2008

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

MIN-8: The Approved RMP will provide for a variety of oil and gas operations and geophysical explorations. These activities will be allowed in the VPA unless precluded by other program prescriptions. The stipulations identified for surface-disturbing activities in Appendix K will generally apply to these activities.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

October 2014: Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2014-0226-EA "Ultra's proposed development of Section 33, T7S, R20E and Section 3, T8S, R20E"

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g. biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Lease UTU-85592

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes: the proposed action is essentially similar to the access, pipeline, and power line corridor that was analyzed in the existing NEPA. Yes: new access, pipeline, and power line corridor is in the same area analysed in the EA number DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0226-EA. The new corridor is only 40 feet west of the previously approved corridor. There are no differences.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource value?

Yes, the alternatives analyzed are appropriate to the new action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

There are no new resource concerns. Since there are no new resource concerns there is no substantial change to the analysis of the new proposed action.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

The direct, indirect and cumulative effects are the same for the proposed action and the approved action in the existing NEPA document.

5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes: scoping and public involvement were carried out in accordance with BLM NEPA Handbook H-I790-1. The private land owner was invited to attend the onsite but declined; a current *affidavit of easement, right-of-way, and surface use agreement* between the operator and surface owner has been received.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1.1. List of Preparers

Name	Role	Discipline
David Gordon	Team Lead	Natural Resource Specialist

Note

Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

/s/ David Gordon

Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Jessica Taylor

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Jerry Kenczka

Signature of the Responsible Official

1/29/2015

Date

Note:

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.